REMARKS

The foregoing Amendment and remarks which follow are responsive to the Advisory Action mailed January 12, 2004 in relation to the above-identified patent application. In the Advisory Action, the Examiner indicated that Applicant's Amendment After Final Action filed December 4, 2003 did not place the present application into condition for allowance since Claims 29-48 are still rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by the Sharma et al. reference.

As a preliminary matter, Applicant notes that the January 12, 2004 Advisory Action was forwarded to prior counsel despite Applicant's prior filing of Power of Attorney transfer documents on June 20, 2003. Copies of these Power of Attorney transfer documents are resubmitted herewith for the Examiner's consideration. Applicant respectfully requests that all future correspondence rendered by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office in relation to the present application be forwarded to the undersigned for further handling.

Summary of Claim Amendments

By this Amendment, Applicant has amended independent Claims 29 and 44 to describe both the die pad and the bonding pad(s) as each being homogenous. Similarly, independent Claim 39 has been amended to describe the bonding pads as being homogenous, with Claim 40 (which is dependent upon Claim 39) being amended to describe the die pad as being homogenous.

Claims 29, 39 and 44 are not Anticipated by the Sharma et al. Reference

Referring now to the Section 102(e) rejection presented by the Examiner, Applicant respectfully submits that each of independent Claims 29, 39 and 44 as amended is not anticipated by the Sharma et al reference. In Figure 1 thereof, the Sharma et al. reference depicts a device 100 which includes an integrated circuit chip 110 attached to the top surface 121 of a die pad 120 through the use of epoxy 160. In addition to the die pad 120, the device 100 includes leads 130, 140 which are disposed in spaced

relation to the die pad 120. Each lead 130 is described as including a top surface 131 and an opposed, generally planar bottom surface 132. Similarly, each lead 140 is described as including a top surface 141 and an opposed, generally planar bottom surface 142. The chip 110 is electrically connected to the leads 130, 140 through the use of bond wires 170, 180. The chip 110, bond wires 170, 180, die pad 120, and leads 130, 140 are covered by molding compound 150.

As is shown in Figure 1 of the Sharma et al. reference and specifically disclosed in the specification thereof, the molding compound 150 encapsulates the chip 110, die pad 120, and leads 130, 140 such that *the bottom surface 122 of the die pad 120, bottom surface 132 of the lead 130, and bottom surface 142 of the lead 140 are* ***co-planar*** *with the bottom surface 152 of the molding compound 150* (**see column 3, line 64 through column 4, line 4**).

In fact, what is depicted in Figure 1 of the Sharma et al. reference as protruding from the bottom surface 152 of the molding compound 150 is ***not*** any portion of the leads 130, 140 or die pad 120, but rather the plating of silver solder which is specifically described in the Sharma et al. reference as being applied to the exposed bottom surfaces 132, 142 of the leads 130, 140 and the exposed bottom surface 122 of the die pad 120 (**see column 4, line 64 through column 5, line 4**).

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the Sharma et al reference fails to teach, suggest or show a portion of a ***homogenous*** bonding pad which defines the lower surface thereof as protruding from the lower surface of a molding compound. Rather, as indicated above, the explicit teaching of the Sharma et al reference is that it is only the plating of silver solder which is applied to the exposed bottom surfaces 132, 142 of the leads 130, 140 which protrudes from the bottom surface 152 of the molding compound 150. Thus, the leads 130, 140, even if homogenous, do not protrude from the bottom surface 152 of the molding compound 150, but rather extend in co-planar relation to the bottom surface 152 as specifically stated in the aforementioned passage of the specification of the Sharma et al reference.

The above-described deficiencies in the teachings of the Sharma et al reference also hold true in relation to those dependent claims of the present application which describe a portion of the ***homogenous*** die pad defining the lower surface thereof as

protruding from the lower surface of the molding compound. As indicated above, the bottom surface 122 of the die pad 120 in the Sharma et al reference is specifically described as being co-planar with the bottom surface 152 of the molding compound 150. In this regard, it is only the plating of silver solder applied to the exposed bottom surface 122 of the die pad 120 which protrudes from the bottom surface 152 of the molding compound 150.

On the basis of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the stated grounds of rejection have been overcome, and that Claims 29-48 are in condition for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account Number 19-4330.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1/28/04 By: _____

Mark B. Garred
Reg. No. 34,823
STETINA BRUNDA GARRED & BRUCKER
75 Enterprise, Suite 250
Aliso Viejo, CA 92656
(949) 855-1246

Customer No. 007663

T:\Client Documents\AMKOR\091a\second.amend.final.doc